

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	. F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,586		05/24/2002	Hans Lander	10191/2175	6461
26646	7590	12/17/2004		EXAMINER	
KENYON	& KENY	YON	HWU, DAVIS D		
ONE BRO	ADWAY				
NEW YORK, NY 10004				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3752	
			DATE MAILED: 10/12/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	·		_
Sulemental	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7
Supplemental Advisory Action	10/030,586	LANDER ET AL.	
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Davis D. Hwu	3752	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 17 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applicable timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a chiplaces the application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, the period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.5 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth	er in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note to	pelow);		
(c) \(\sime\) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying t	he
(d) \square they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	·		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendmer	nt
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT place the	ł
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • •	•	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme			
10 Other:	David Hara	Primari Gxuminer 17	11)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 10/030,586

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however, they are not persuasive. Nally et al. discloses the structural limitations and Rhoades teaches that the method of coating surfaces of a fuel injector with PTFE is known in the art.